



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CURRENT OPINION

Defining the Aims of the War

Many voices in England are being raised to commend the explicit statements of President Wilson regarding the war aims of the Allies. There is also a steady insistence that the issue be not lost in fog. H. G. Wells, writing in the *London Daily Mail*, insists that there is a definitely clear purpose in view—that the aim is undoubtedly the separation of the German people from the control of the Hohenzollerns and the military group. In plain language we want a revolution in Germany. He urges therefore that all reactionary sections in England be branded for what they are and that England's clear meaning and purpose be set forth so that it cannot be mistaken by the German people.

If the German populace feel that the Allies will give them no mercy when militarism is crushed they will naturally prefer, even at great cost of suffering, to stand behind their autocracy, so as to be better able to bargain at the end. If the Allies would assure them of certain liberty and full opportunity in the coming world of peace the overthrow of Prussian militarism would be easier to accomplish. "A plain statement of our war aims that did no more than set out honestly and convincingly the terms the Allies would make with a democratic, republican Germany . . . would absolutely revolutionize the internal psychology of Germany."

This note is struck also in the *Athenaeum Supplement* for December, 1917. The writer fears that the high idealism of the early days of the war is being lost and men seem to have forgotten the object of the struggle and to have transferred their loyalty to the war itself. He calls for a clear and definite statement—a statement that will conquer the soul of the German people—"mercilessly explicit and ruthlessly intelli-

gible." It is blundering insanity to expect that Germany will accept a new form of government dictated by foreigners. But a call to a new era, the proposal of a League of Nations, which is the antithesis of Prussian statecraft, will rally the allegiance of mankind. Germany is not a solid block. The people of Germany alone can prevent the recurrence of this crime of their rulers. Hence the necessity of reaching them with an appeal which they can understand. This program of a glorious new world would be a sword of the spirit fighting the battle of democracy. "By repudiating plans of nationalist aggression it would convince the enemy that he is fighting, not against nations who seek to destroy him, but against a future in which, until he has been converted, he will find no room."

The most incisive word in this article is the demand made in the name of the soldiers who die that they be assured that their death is not useless. Fine writing about their heroism is not enough. "In the front line, from which men can see their friends of yesterday hanging, poor remnants, on the German wire, it is read with a bitter smile. What encourages soldiers is one thing and one thing alone—the thought that, if they must still endure, they endure for the sake of a just and lasting peace."

Either a war is a crusade or it is a crime; there is no half-way house. If right is the Allies' goal then right must be the Allies' limit. For that they are bound to fight; they are free to fight for nothing more. And if it would be treason to the dead to lay down arms before Germany consents to the principles of a just settlement, to continue the war for motives of economic advantage or nationalist ambition after her consent is obtainable would be treason to the dead, and to the living, and to the unborn. Therefore it is necessary, by a clear statement of aims, to close the door on those motives. Therefore it is necessary to seek her consent, if

not with hope, at least with frankness and sincerity.

Arthur Henderson writes also in the *Athenaeum* for December, taking his text from President Wilson. He points out some elements which must be secured if the coming peace is to "make the world safe for democracy." The desire is not for an unsatisfactory or premature peace, but neither is it for a peace which will secure the political, economic, and social enslavement of Germany. The real enemy is German militarism—the faith that brute force is an ideal instrument for attaining national ambitions. This must be destroyed. It will be attained when Germany's military machine is discredited in the eyes of her own people. It is a national, spiritual change which is desired—a new conception of national and international responsibility.

If the world is to be made safe for democracy the peace with Germany must give all safeguards essential to the future life and natural development of free democracy. Peace will be futile if the Allies intend to withhold the conditions of freedom from a real German democracy. "It is clear, therefore, that the Allies in their fight against German military and economic domination ought to declare openly and categorically that they pursue no similar ambitions of their own." "It will be a matter of little concern to the German people whether they live under an autocratic or democratic government if they know the Allies intend to strangle them commercially after the termination of this war." It is useless to call on the German people to democratize their government if we intend to withhold the conditions of absolute freedom.

The Allies have a right to insist on continuation of the war until an honorable and desirable settlement of the issues is reached, but they have no right to continue it when the German people show a real disposition to share in the establishment of a stable peace founded on democratic principles.

"German militarism has already been defeated; it is now in process of being discredited and a free German democracy will know how to deal with the shattered remnants."

In the *Asiatic Review* for November, Platon E. Drakoules, delegate of the Greek Labor League to the London Conference of August, enumerates the conditions of peace desired by the Greek Labor League and the Greek Socialist Party, as follows:

First: Kaiserism must be abolished. Second: Militarism must be destroyed. Individuals and companies to be forbidden to manufacture weapons. Third: International treaties to be sacred and inviolable. Fourth: No state to be allowed to keep a permanent army under pain of being excluded from the economic union of those states which accept disarmament. Five: The freedom of each nationality to be guaranteed. Six: No province or island to be annexed if the population of it objects to such a change. Indemnities to be paid unless it is decided to establish a United States of Europe. There should also be in all the nations an organized endeavor to create an ideal of international ethics and international rectitude and to dispel the Prussian superstition about the sanctity of the state; a council of nations looking towards the United States of Europe; and a supreme court of nations representative of the international will.

We want the war to be continued until the triumph of truth is achieved, that is, until the Entente is victorious. . . . A peoples' peace as distinct from a plutocratic peace must be insisted upon. We need organized freedom all over Europe, organized equality and organized fraternity and we want the abolition of *all* forms of cruelty seeing that human progress is effected in proportion as human cruelty is diminished.

More Bible Light from the East

In connection with a recent though minor service of archaeology to science one recalls the classic instance of the assistance the literal spade can render to scholars' metaphorical "digging." A few years ago the excavations at Zenjirti, in North Syria, un-

earthed an inscription of Bar-Rekub, king of that city, in which there occurred the phrase "beth Kalamu." This proved an enigma. Semitic scholars, ignorant of any Kalamu in the Aramaic dialects, were driven for elucidation to the cognate Assyrian word, and concluded—with hesitation, it is true—that "beth Kalamu" must mean "house of totality," that is, "single house" or "a house for everything." Still more daring was the proposal that "Kalamu" stood, by metathesis, for "Malkuth," and so the phrase must mean simply "royal palace."

The excavations proceeded. With rare good fortune another royal inscription was discovered which dovetailed in a remarkable way into the previous one and dissipated its difficulty at a touch. The very first line ran, "I am Kalamu, son of Haya"—"Kalamu" in the "beth-Kalamu" puzzle was a proper name!

And now the situation repeats itself; a gratifying feature of the present incident is that it is a biblical difficulty that is solved—one of long standing.

In Obad., vs. 20b, we read, "The captivity of Jerusalem which is in Sepharad shall possess the cities of the south." Where was "Sepharad"? Some scholars have sought to identify it with "Ç parda" of the Persian inscriptions, a region somewhere in eastern Asia Minor; others have contended for "Shaparda" mentioned in Sargon's records, and located in Southwest Media. Again the attempt has been made to cut the Gordian knot at one drastic stroke—there was no such place at all; "Sepharad" was merely a corrupt dittography of "Zarephath" in the line above. Or still bolder has been the assumption of the Targum of Onkelos. With that fine scorn of scientific subtleties so characteristic of rabbinical thought, it has rendered the word "Aspamyā" (i.e., Spain), an identification indorsed by all succeeding Judaism in their distinction of the Hebrews of Spain as "Sephardic," in opposition to the "Askena-

zic" of Germany. In the absence of determining evidence, however, one guess was probably as legitimate as another. Now we know.

In the June number of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Stanley A. Cook reviews Professor Eno Littman's recently published *Lydian Inscriptions* (Vol. VI of "Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis"), specially discussing a Lydian-Aramaic bilingual inscription found at Sardis. It is a brief funerary tablet stating that a certain cave, with its appurtenances, belongs to the individual named, and concludes in the usual style, calling down divine vengeance upon any desecrators. The inscription is dated in the tenth year of Artaxerxes; which Artaxerxes is not stated, but Cook thinks, on paleographic grounds, the second or third.

The special interest for Old Testament scholars is that it definitely identifies Sardis as the biblical Sepharad, describing the cave as located "in Sepharad."

So much is clear gain. But, too, the inscription gives us one more concrete evidence of the wide diffusion of the Aramaic language throughout the Persian Empire. Evidently it also points to an actual settlement of Aramaeans in Sardis. Professor Cook cogently argues that it is highly probable there was at least a nucleus of Aramaean traders in the city. But, with the very natural impulse to extract all the advantage possible from every gain, he goes on to question whether the inscription may not be evidence of the presence even of Jews. Isa. 49:12 refers to the Jews in Sinim, "read Syene, i.e., Elephantine," and the Assouan papyri show that their language was Aramaic. This lends some probability to the supposition that the Aramaic-speaking inhabitants of Sardis were the Jewish "captivity which is in Sepharad" (Obad., vs. 20). It is an interesting speculation. We can agree that it is "tempting to conjecture" that such was the situation—

highly tempting: it might throw light on the disputed date of Obad., vss. 15-21, and, too, perhaps, have bearing on the none too well-established record of a deportation of Jews to Asia Minor in the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus. But it is pure conjecture. Cook's analogy on the Aramaic of the Assouan Jews is of no value, for this was the colloquial language of all post-exilic Judaism. The personal names in the inscription, M-n-y and K-l-m-y, while they *might* be Semitic, can scarcely be Jewish. The imprecation by Artemis, too, though not in itself surprising, yet uncoupled with the name of Yahweh, as in the Elephantine papyri, has weight as evidence against Jewish authorship.

On the whole, we can but be content with the identification established by the inscription and hope that further developments may sustain Professor Cook's "tempting conjecture"; at present it lacks corroborative evidence.

The Struggle for Existence and Mutual Aid

The *Hibbert Journal* for January has translated from the Dutch an article by Dr. J. Macleod. He shows that the "struggle for existence" of the older scientists has been greatly misunderstood. It is not a warfare with other organisms so much as a battle with the forces of nature—a struggle for self-preservation in which not a single other living individual is harmed. Plants, birds, animals, adapt themselves to meet natural conditions. To be sure there is also much mutual destruction in the animate kingdom; but as we know plants and animals better we see that the principle of mutual aid is everywhere evident. Underneath these two main laws of nature—destructive strife and mutual aid—lies the one principle, *work for existence*. No living being may neglect this work with impunity. Here is now the true scientific meaning of the struggle for existence. "The beast of

prey that pursues another to obtain food—the bull that uses its horns to ward off attack—the tree that protects its tender buds from the rough wintry weather . . . the bee that builds honeycombs in the hollow of the tree and collects honey for its offspring—they all *work* for self-preservation or for the preservation of their young."

Man also is under the law. He obeys the compulsion to carry out this work. Nature teaches him a hundred different ways. Which example shall he follow? Strife is a fact. Mutual aid is also a fact. But a study of the higher living beings, all many-celled animals and plants, shows that they are societies of one-celled beings which are so closely bound together by mutual aid that they grow into a whole which appears as a living unity. A many-celled being is unthinkable without mutual aid. Mankind is such a society. Every human being is a member. The society has come to be what it is by mutual aid among its members, otherwise it would be only a crowd. As soon as one member of society wages war on its fellow-members the society itself is brought into confusion and the disorder is harmful to all. Members of society strive to get wealth by unsocial means and excuse themselves by the slogan "the struggle for existence." But science refuses to defend the principle of ruthless struggle. Hence war and political strife are condemned by the scientific view of the principle of mutual aid, of work for existence.

Science urges us on to a glorious future. The ideals of science agree with the longing for something higher which has risen for centuries from the hearts of mankind. "May we hope that science will teach us the art of attaining the ideal of humanity. It can overcome all difficulties by untiring labor."

The Indictment against Christianity

A long article which is worthy of careful reading appears from the pen of Professor W. R. Inger in the *Quarterly Review* of

January under the foregoing title. It is a serious attempt to defend Christianity in the face of modern attacks. The war has certainly stained the reputation of Europe. There has been something fundamentally wrong with European civilization and the disease seems to be a moral one. It is natural therefore that the custodians of religion and morals should be accused of failure; that Christianity should be considered bankrupt and incapable of exerting a saving influence on human character and action. Christianity must answer the arraignment.

It ought to be clearly pointed out that there is no evidence that the historical Christ ever intended to found a new institutional religion. Moreover that Christ never expected nor taught his disciples to expect that his teaching would meet with wide acceptance and exercise political influence. The method of Christianity is alien to all externalism and machinery. Still further, when we speak of Christianity as a factor in human life we must not identify it with the opinions and actions of the multitude who are nominally Christian. Probably the pure principles of the gospel were expressed in time only in the era of the persecutions.

Over against the genius of Christianity stands the historical Catholicism of institutional and essentially political character. Its policy has been always directed to self-preservation and aggrandizement. Institutional religion does not represent the gospel of Christ but the opinions of a mass of nominal Christians. The real gospel would pull up by the roots not only militarism but its analogue in civil life, the desire to exploit other people for private gain. But the founder of Christianity had no illusions as to the reception his message would receive. It may be, however, that it is not too optimistic to hope that the accumulated experience of humanity and a slow modification for the better of human nature itself may

at last eliminate the wickedest and most insane of our maleficent institutions. The human race has probably hundreds of thousands of years to live while civilization is yet young.

Whatever forms reconstruction may take Christianity will have its part in the rebuilding of Europe. It may point to the misery and ruin that have followed the neglect of its values and precepts. It is not Christianity which is condemned at the bar of civilization but civilization which has destroyed itself because it has not followed Christ. But a spiritual religion can promise no catalogue of blessings or cursings to those who obey or disobey its principles. Social happiness and peace would certainly follow a whole-hearted acceptance of Christian principles, but they would not certainly bring wealth or empire. Nevertheless the future does not belong to lawless violence.

Preaching after the War

"What kind of preaching will be effective in the new conditions of the new world after the war?" asks Rev. Joseph Wood in the January *Hibbert Journal*. When fault is found with the church today it is chiefly the sermon that is criticized. How will the methods and message of the pulpit be changed by the terrible experiences of the war?

Though some argue that the world will go back again to its old ways and ideals we must not believe it, for "unless we enter upon a different civilization, a different social order, a different idea of the values of life, the war will have been fought in vain, its agony and bloody sweat prove a sheer waste." Others argue that we can only drift until the guns cease, for who can tell what conditions will be after the war? This is the great folly of the church. When laymen, serious and level-headed, are busy with schemes of reconstruction, financial, political, industrial, educational, and social, it would be unpardonable neglect on the

part of the church to refrain from considering its future program until the new time arrives.

More than ever before the preacher will have to know the hearts of his hearers, their point of view, their experience, the limits and possibilities of their minds. This is the great lesson of the battle front. No preacher can face the men who are facing death and influence them without knowing the men. The war has shown us three divine things as unexpected features in the mentality of common men. First, the divine compulsion of duty, duty to country, to the call of honor, to freedom and justice, to wronged and oppressed humanity. Secondly, the power and glory of self-sacrifice in every heart. Men gave their life-blood gladly because it was the only way to save country and humanity. In the third place there is the clear realization that spiritual values are higher than material. The truth shines clear to all ages that not in things but in souls is a nation's true life, that its destiny is controlled not by wealth or armies or extent of territory but by the heroic temper of its people. In the rediscovery of these three great things lies the hope of the churches and of future religion. These are religion. They should be the stuff and fiber of preaching. Spiritual values, great ethical topics, practical issues, must take the place of intellectual controversy. The man in the Y.M.C.A. hut doesn't care about the Trinity. "Discourses on the fall of man or the flames of hell sound to him like the rattling of dried peas in a bladder." There must be the accent of invitation, the warmth of concern, the compelling persuasion men feel when the preacher himself

thrills to the sense of God and himself bears and carries the sorrows of his people. "sharing the burden the Master bears in bringing many sons to glory."

Religion for Children

This is an appeal from the pen of Stanley B. Hazzard in the February number of *Education*. War times are times of anguish but they also yield good fruit. To the educator there stands out clearly the thought that if the men of tomorrow are not to make the mistakes of the men of today then the children must be trained by a severe and rigid discipline. "With sin, on such a gigantic scale as we witness it today, staring us in the face on the one hand and the empirical knowledge that no experience so permeates all life's activities and interests as does the religious experience on the other, what conviction could be more profound and wholesome than this: that the most legitimate venture in the training of a child is the creating of an atmosphere in which the child may have a genuine religious experience?" This is the profoundest conviction of the philosophy of education. The conservation of character depends upon the severe religious discipline of our children. The average Sunday school does not meet the demand. It is but a means of acquainting the child with the facts recorded in the Bible rather than helping him to find God in nature, in history, in daily experience and thus preparing him to take his place in the world as a Christian man or woman. All the activities of the child should be lit up by religion. Religion is not something added to life but the crowning influence upon life in all its many and varied aspects.